

Maine *Learning Results* Review Advisory Committee Minutes, March 3, 2005

In Attendance

Barnes, Bernhardt, Cannan, Phillips, Perkins, LaChance, Wright, Collins, Hupp, Howard, Fortini, Eberle, Dancause, Seaberg, Multer, Geiger, Dorrer, Berger, Major

Welcome & Introduction

Phillips opened the meeting with contextual remarks about legislative and administrative debate on the Maine *Learning Results* (MLR) and its implementation. He called on members to listen to that debate, but not to allow it to disrupt our work. He commented that he personally finds our work refreshing “as we cast our vision forward.”

O'Connor reviewed the work of the last meeting, recalling the distinctions among the three groups working on aspects of the MLR: the *Learning Results* Steering Committee, the *Learning Results* Review Advisory Committee, and the Standards Assessment and Regional Services Team (SARST). She noted that three themes emerged for the Review Advisory Committee's work: stakeholder inclusion, real world application, and tapping the expertise of the business world.

Bernhardt reviewed the group norms before turning the group's attention to the list of values and goals that will guide the review advisory committee's work.

Values & Goals

The Committee opted “to go slow in order to go fast” on this segment of the day's work. Members reviewed the draft document prepared by Bernhardt bullet-by-bullet, recommending substantial changes. In addition to changes in the wording, a strong statement of principle and intent will be placed at the beginning of the document, and a glossary will be appended. An understanding was reached that the revised MLR would be written so as to be understood by secondary school students. The DoE staff will prepare and distribute the revised Guiding Values & Goals for the work of the *Learning Results* Review Advisory Committee as well as the work of the various Content Area Panels, Focus Groups, and Experts.

In the course of the discussion, the Committee digressed from the MLR review to questions of how to make the MLR a vehicle for school transformation. Conversation was wide-ranging on the subject of transforming schools, but at 11:59 AM, Bernhardt successfully corralled the group back to its own playground (viz. overseeing the review of the *Learning Results*).

Maine's Common Core of Learning & the MLR

The Committee generated the following list of similarities from the Common Core and the MLR documents to serve as a bridge between that work and what they hoped would result from the review of MLR (MLR-rev).

1. The Common Core communicated passion, urgency, need, intentionality, and responsibility.

2. The MLR included a system of accountability, though perhaps in the MLR-rev this will need to be increased, clarified, or refined.
3. The Common Core emphasized the interdisciplinary aspects of learning.
4. The Maine Learning Results defined content knowledge to be acquired.
5. The group that created the Common Core included significant representation from the business community.
6. Work on the Common Core reflected consideration of demographic changes in Maine.

The Committee also created a list of differences to distinguish between either of these documents and what they hoped the MLR-rev would be.

1. In 1990, the job losses in Maine were primarily in the low-skilled sector of the labor market. In 2005, job losses cross almost all labor market sectors.
2. The standards and performance indicators of the MLR is not a manageable system. MLR-rev should be more manageable.
3. The MLR-rev must be more clearly focused on the context for instruction than the MLR or the Common Core.
4. The process for creating the MLR-rev must foster two-way communication more than the MLR process did.
5. The process for creating the MLR-rev must build in continuous learning for generative skills about learning; it should be seamless and bottom-up.
6. The dispositions that are embedded in the Guiding Principle of the Learning Results need to be brought to the surface of the MLR-rev.
7. The processes for creating both the MLR and the Common Core did not include parent participation nor representation from the wider community (except business). The MLR-rev process should include these.
8. Both previous documents were two-dimensional, limiting explanation. The MLR-rev should be web-based and hyperlinked to allow deeper exploration.
9. The Common Core did not demand measurement. MLR-rev should indicate a clear connection to a system of assessment.

Communication List

Bernhardt solicited suggestions for groups or individuals with whom to share information and drafts as the Committee's work progresses. The following list was created.

1. Learning Results Steering Committee (LRSC)
2. The Maine Education Association
3. The Business Research and Economic Development Council
4. The Maine Economic Growth Council
5. The Maine State Chamber of Commerce
6. The Office of Policy and Legal Analysis
7. Dr. Phil and Patrick Ende

Criteria for Standards

Bernhardt distributed a packet entitled "Criteria for Standards." The committee members participated in a "final word" reading protocol on it.

Education Reform Review Process

Bernhardt distributed a draft of the graphic showing the MLR Review process and invited comment.

1. Phillips noted that the interdisciplinary aspects of the reform were not included. He suggested reshuffling members of the Content Area Panels to look at interdisciplinary instruction. Some discussion followed and Phillips later sketched a graphic organizer to show a three-step process beginning with Content Area Panels, then shuffling those members to interdisciplinary groups, and finally passing the drafts on to groups for context analysis.
2. Eberle suggested (via Bernhardt) that content area experts make a specific recommendation for Content Area Panels to react to suggestions from experts (rather than drafting their own recommendations from scratch).
3. Dorrer suggested the use of *Occupational Taxonomy* and *Equipped for the Future*.
4. Perkins suggested making content area panels more inclusive (fewer teachers) and making focus groups more representative of teachers from all levels, disciplines, and geographic areas.
5. Wright suggested including teacher educators, noting that current post-secondary representation on the Review Advisory Committee does not include education professors.

In Closing

Bernhardt strove to clarify the points on which the Committee came to agreement about the Review process. The following points appear to have Committee support.

1. The reliance on national expertise for guidance early in the process.
2. The need for large group reflection on proposals.
3. The need for a workhorse to carry revision through the process (Content Area Panels).

Among the points requiring clarification or agreement are the following.

1. The sequence of input from expertise, content area panels, and focus groups.
2. The composition of the Content Area Panels.
3. Whether the Guiding Principles themselves are beyond revision.
4. Where to include technology education within the MLR-rev.

Next Meeting: March 24, 2005 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM. Location to be announced.

Next Recorder: Karoldene Barnes